

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTINA FOREGGER,
Plaintiff,
v.
REDFIN CORPORATION,
Defendant.

Case No. [24-cv-05701-HSG](#)

**ORDER REFERRING REQUESTS TO
DISQUALIFY TO ANOTHER
DISTRICT JUDGE FOR DECISION**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 44, 46

Pro se Plaintiff Christina Foregger has filed two motions which, *inter alia*, raise assertions of judicial bias as to the undersigned. *See* Dkt. No. 44 at 4; Dkt. No. 46 at 2. Under 28 U.S.C. § 144,

Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party, such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned to hear such proceeding.


In support of her initial motion, Plaintiff filed a declaration claiming that the undersigned Judge “refuse[d] to answer . . . [a] question,” “falsely claim[ed] documents are not attached,” and did not “report unethical behavior.” Dkt. No. 44 at 4. Plaintiff then filed a second motion to disqualify, attaching correspondence with the Ninth Circuit regarding Plaintiff’s efforts to file a complaint of judicial misconduct there. Dkt. No. 46.

//
//
//
//
//
//
//
//

1 Assuming without deciding that Plaintiff Foregger's filings satisfy the requirements of
2 section 144, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-14, the Clerk shall randomly reassign the requests to
3 disqualify the undersigned to be heard by another district judge. The hearing set for July 31, 2025
4 before Judge Gilliam is VACATED.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: 6/13/2025

7 
8 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28